

APPENDIX G9

SOCIAL ISSUES AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix G9 Social Issues and Environmental Justice G9-1

G9.1	Social Issues.....	G9-1
G9.2	Environmental Justice.....	G9-1
	G9.2.1 Affected Environment.....	G9-1
	G9.2.2 Environmental Consequences.....	G9-4

Tables

G9-1	Population, Race, and Ethnicity, 2000.....	G9-2
G9-2	Income and Poverty, 1999	G9-3
G9-3	Housing, Labor Force, and Employment, 2000	G9-3
G9-4	Preliminary Contractor On-Site Labor Expenditures (\$1,000) and Number of Jobs	G9-4

G9.1 SOCIAL ISSUES

During the planning process, uncertainty, especially for irrigators (e.g., not knowing how to plan for the future for crops, on-farm investments, etc.), was mentioned as a social issue. Uncertainty for all potentially affected people will continue until the project is implemented.

Issues identified by the public were considered during alternative formulation.

Potential social issues during construction, including employment opportunities, noise, dust, and disruption of traffic are addressed previously in this document.

G9.2 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, dated February 11, 1994, requires agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minorities and low-income populations and communities as well as the equity of the distribution of the benefits and risks of their decisions. Environmental justice addresses the fair treatment of people of all races and incomes with respect to actions affecting the environment. Fair treatment implies that no group of people should bear a disproportionate share of negative impacts from an environmental action.

To comply with the environmental justice policy established by the Secretary, all U.S. Department of the Interior agencies are to identify and evaluate any anticipated effects, direct or indirect, from the proposed project, action, or decision on minority and low-income populations and communities, including the equity of the distribution of the benefits and risks. Accordingly, this section examines the anticipated distributional equity of alternative-associated impacts with respect to potentially affected minority and economically disadvantaged groups.

G9.2.1 Affected Environment

This section provides baseline demographic information used in the analysis of environmental justice impacts.

G9.2.1.1 *Race and Ethnicity*

Ten counties approximate the area of potential impact from implementation of the alternatives. Population data from the 2000 census for the State of California and the ten counties are shown in Table G9-1. The percentages of population for seven racial categories: White, Black or African American, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Some Other Race, and Two or More Races are shown. The percentages of total racial minority population and the Hispanic or Latino populations, a minority ethnic group, are also shown.

Appendix G9

Social Issues and Environmental Justice

Table G9-1
Population, Race, and Ethnicity, 2000

Geographic Area	Total Population	Race								Hispanic or Latino (of any race)
		One Race						Two or More Races	Total Racial Minority Population ¹	
		White	Black or African American	American Indian and Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race			
California	33,871,648	59.5%	6.7%	1.0%	10.9%	0.3%	16.8%	4.7%	40.5%	32.4%
Contra Costa County	948,816	65.5%	9.4%	0.6%	11.0%	0.4%	8.1%	5.1%	34.5%	17.7%
Fresno County	799,407	54.3%	5.3%	1.6%	8.1%	0.1%	25.9%	4.7%	45.7%	44.0%
Kern County	661,645	61.6%	6.0%	1.5%	3.4%	0.1%	23.2%	4.1%	38.4%	38.4%
Kings County	129,461	53.7%	8.3%	1.7%	3.1%	0.2%	28.3%	4.8%	46.3%	43.6%
Madera County	123,109	62.2%	4.1%	2.6%	1.3%	0.2%	24.4%	5.2%	37.8%	44.3%
Merced County	210,554	56.2%	3.8%	1.2%	6.8%	0.2%	26.1%	5.7%	43.8%	45.3%
San Joaquin County	563,598	58.1%	6.7%	1.1%	11.4%	0.3%	16.3%	6.0%	41.9%	30.5%
San Luis Obispo County	246,681	84.6%	2.0%	0.9%	2.7%	0.1%	6.2%	3.4%	15.4%	16.3%
Stanislaus County	446,997	69.3%	2.6%	1.3%	4.2%	0.3%	16.8%	5.4%	30.7%	31.7%
Tulare County	368,021	58.1%	1.6%	1.6%	3.3%	0.1%	30.8%	4.6%	41.9%	50.8%

Source: US Census 2000.

¹Includes Black or African American, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Some Other Race, and Two or More Races.

In comparison to the State of California, four area counties (Fresno, Kings, Merced, and Tulare) have greater percentages of total racial minority and ethnic (Hispanic or Latino) populations. San Joaquin County has a slightly greater percentage of racial minority populations, while Kern and Madera counties have greater percentages of Hispanic or Latino populations.

G9.2.1.2 Low Income

Low income populations in the area are identified by several socioeconomic characteristics. As categorized by the 2000 census, specific characteristics used in this description of the existing environment are income (per capita and median family), percentage of the population below poverty (all persons and families), substandard housing, and unemployment rates.

As shown in Table G9-2, based on income in 1999 as reported in the 2000 census, all of the area counties (except Contra Costa) have lower per capita and median family incomes less than the State. All counties (except Contra Costa and San Luis Obispo) have greater percentages of all persons and families below poverty.

Appendix G9

Social Issues and Environmental Justice

Table G9-2
Income and Poverty, 1999

Area	Money Income (dollars)		Percent Below Poverty Level	
	Per Capita	Median Family	All Persons	Families
California	22,711	53,025	14.2	10.6
Contra Costa County	30,615	73,039	7.6	5.4
Fresno County	15,495	38,455	22.9	17.6
Kern County	15,760	39,403	20.8	16.8
Kings County	15,848	38,111	19.5	15.8
Madera County	14,682	39,226	21.4	15.9
Merced County	14,257	38,009	21.7	16.9
San Joaquin County	17,635	46,919	17.7	13.5
San Luis Obispo County	21,864	52,447	12.8	6.8
Stanislaus County	16,913	44,703	16.0	12.3
Tulare County	14,006	36,297	23.9	18.8

Source: US Census 2000.

Other measures of low income, such as substandard housing and employment (shown in Table G9-3), also characterize demographic data in relation to environmental justice. Substandard housing units are those overcrowded and lacking complete plumbing facilities. The percentage of occupied housing units with 1.01 or more occupants per room in Fresno, Kings, Merced, and Tulare counties was greater than the State of California. Fresno, Kern, Madera, Merced and Tulare counties had percentages of housing units lacking complete plumbing facilities greater than the State. The 2000 unemployment rates in all area counties (except Contra Costa and San Luis Obispo) ranged from 10.3 to 13.6 percent, which was higher than the State unemployment rate of 7 percent.

Table G9-3
Housing, Labor Force, and Employment, 2000

Area	Housing Units				Civilian Labor Force	
	Total Occupied	Percent Substandard ¹	Total	Percent Substandard ²	Percent in Labor Force ³	Unemployment Rate (percent)
California	11,502,870	15.2	12,214,549	0.9	62.4	7.0
Contra Costa County	344,129	7.4	354,577	0.5	65.5	4.8
Fresno County	252,940	17.1	270,767	1.1	59.9	11.8
Kern County	208,652	15.0	231,564	1.2	56.5	12.0
Kings County	34,418	15.6	36,563	0.7	51.1	13.6
Madera County	36,155	15.3	40,387	1.1	53.5	13.2
Merced County	63,815	20.0	68,373	1.6	59.5	13.1
San Joaquin County	181,629	14.0	189,160	0.8	59.8	10.3
San Luis Obispo County	92,739	5.6	102,275	0.5	58.3	5.9
Stanislaus County	145,146	13.9	150,807	0.7	61.2	11.7
Tulare County	110,385	19.3	119,639	1.3	59.8	12.7

Source: US Census 2000.

Notes:

¹ 1.01 or more occupants per room.

² Lacking complete plumbing facilities.

³ Population 16 years and over in the labor force.

Appendix G9

Social Issues and Environmental Justice

G9.2.2 Environmental Consequences

This section addresses whether any group of people, including racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic groups, would bear a disproportionate share of adverse environmental effects from implementation of the alternatives.

The immediate study area (Fresno, Kings, and Merced counties) and other counties potentially affected by construction of the alternatives (Kern, Madera, San Joaquin, and Stanislaus) contain high percentages of racial and ethnic minorities and persons and families below the poverty level. Unemployment is significantly higher in these counties than in other areas of the State. Consequently, the potential exists for low-income and minority populations to be disproportionately affected.

Preliminary contractor on-site labor expenditures and jobs are shown in Table G9-4. It is anticipated construction would provide some short-term employment opportunities for minority and low-income individuals.

Table G9-4
Preliminary Contractor On-Site Labor Expenditures (\$1,000) and Number of Jobs

Alternative	Year of Construction											
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Delta Disposal-Carquinez Strait												
Expenditures	2,789	2,789	3,379	3,479	21,739	19,128	21,089	19,615	10,981	11,170	3,659	
Jobs	75	75	91	94	587	517	570	531	299	305	99	
Delta Disposal - Chipps Island												
Expenditures	2,789	2,789	3,312	3,142	17,275	18,853	20,815	19,340	10,775	11,048	5,893	
Jobs	75	75	89	92	467	509	562	523	293	300	159	
In-Valley Disposal												
Expenditures	3,540	3,540	3,785	3,681	17,812	27,575	24,044	21,376	58,87	601		
Jobs	96	96	102	99	481	744	650	578	159	16		
Ocean Disposal - Point Estero												
Expenditures	2,791	2,791	2,791	4,195	16,140	20,888	23,497	22,286	13,190	11,620	6,118	3,258
Jobs	75	75	75	114	536	564	635	603	360	318	168	89

Appendix G9

Social Issues and Environmental Justice

Issues to be considered in identification of environmental justice impacts include whether resources affected by the project are used by a minority or low-income community, identification of disproportionate environmental, human health or economic impacts, and whether resources used for or affected by this project support subsistence living.

No human health impacts for any human population have been identified. Thus, an adverse environmental justice impact would not occur. Uses of resources, including support of subsistence living by minority or low-income communities, have not been analyzed. *To address potential economic environmental justice impacts at this level of analysis, data from the regional impact analysis is needed.*

At the next level of analysis, while specific locations of facilities for each alternative are being determined, it will be important to identify local minority and low-income communities to ensure they are not disproportionately adversely affected. At that time, it will also be important to identify the use of affected resources by minority and low-income groups, including whether they support subsistence living. As the economic impacts are refined, the impacts to minority and low-income communities will also need to be addressed.